



Reg. for Exam
H. Cho
PATENT APPLICATION 11/2003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Yoshitaka SASAKI et al.

Group Art Unit: 3729

Application No.: 09/865,445

Examiner: T. NGUYEN

Filed: May 29, 2001

Docket No.: 104241.01

For: A METHOD OF MANUFACTURING THIN-FILM MAGNETIC HEAD MATERIAL
(AS AMENDED)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED
OCT 29 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Sir:

In reply to the August 6, 2003 Office Action, reconsideration is requested based on the following remarks.

Claims 3-4 are pending. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,226,018 to Nakanishi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied art does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a detection element to be used for detecting an amount of processing when specific processing is performed on the head material, as claimed in claim 3.

The Office Action asserts that element (8) of Nakanishi discloses the detection element, as recited in claim 3. Applicants respectfully disagree. The magnetic film 8 is one

of the elements making up the thin-film transducer 2 and is not used for detecting an amount of processing when specific processing is performed on the head material. As such, the magnetic film 8 disclosed in Nakanishi is different from the detection element of claim 3. Accordingly, the electrodes 5 and conductor 6, shown in Figure 2 of Nakanishi, are also different from the electrode and conductor recited in claim 3, respectively.

Assuming *arguendo*, that the magnetic film 8, the electrode 5 and the conductor 6 of Nakanishi correspond to the detection element, the electrode, and the conductor of claim 3, Nakanishi still does not disclose the claimed feature of forming the electrode in the inter-row cutting section. Claim 3 recites that the electrode is formed in the inter-row cutting section. The claimed electrode is therefore to be removed when adjacent rows in the head material are separated. In contrast, the electrodes 5 of Nakanishi et al. remain in the core block 1a, as shown in Figure 2. This shows that the electrodes 5 are formed away from the planes A-A (inter-row cutting section).

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 as anticipated by Nakanishi is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 3, from which claim 4 depends. Further, as discussed above with respect to claim 3, assuming *arguendo* that the magnetic film 8, the electrodes 5 and the conductor 6 of Nakanishi correspond to the detection element, the electrode, and the conductor of claim 3, respectively. As recited in claim 4, the detection element and the conductor are formed in the intra-row cutting section. The detection element and the conductor are therefore to be removed when adjacent ones of the head-to-be sections in each row are separated.

In contrast, the magnetic film 8 and conductor 6 of Nakanishi et al. remain in the core block 1a, as shown in Figure 2. This shows that the magnetic film 8 and the conductor 6 are formed away from planes B-B (intra-row cutting section).

Thus, even assuming that the magnetic film 8, the electrode 5 and the conductor 6 of Nakanishi et al. correspond to the detection element, the electrode, and the conductor of claim 3, respectively, the feature of claim 4 that the detection element and the conductor are formed in the intra-row cutting section is not disclosed by Nakanishi et al.


Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 with respect to the teaching of Nakanishi et al. is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

JAO:KMM/jfb

Date: October 28, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461